



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/648,506

08/25/2003

Vijay Mital

MSFT-1949/301416.1

4218

41505 7590 04/14/2009

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

LIU, LIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2445

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,506

Applicant(s)

MITAL ET AL.

Examiner

LIN LIU

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 01/29/2009.
2. Claims 1-23 are pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/29/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6. Applicant has amended **claims 1, 10 and 19** to include the additional limitation *“the first metadata attributes describing a format of data processed by the first service entity and the second metadata attributes describing a format of data processed by the second service entity”* which is not presently supported by the specification. Applicant has not pointed out where in the specification such limitation can be found.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims **1-6, 8-16, 18, 19 and 21-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1)** in view of **Evans et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0019560 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 1**, Tracey teaches a method comprising:

classifying actions associated with first and second service entities, the first service entity being associated with a first application service (Tracey: page 11, paragraph 176, noted the debt collection application) and the second service entity being associated with a second application service different from the first application service (Tracey: page 11, paragraph 170, noted the collector application), the first service entity of the first application service having first metadata attributes associated

therewith (Tracey: fig. 3, noted the debtor's metadata attributes) and the second service entity of the second application service having second metadata attributes associated therewith (Tracey: fig. 2-3, noted the collector's metadata attributes), the first metadata attributes describing a format of data processed by the first service entity (Tracey: fig. 2, and page 9, paragraph 154, noted the debtor's data fields), the first metadata attributes of the first service entity being different from the second metadata attributes of the second service entity (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table), wherein each action is classified according to its availability (Tracey: fig. 3, page 4, paragraph 80, paragraph 6, paragraphs 89 & 95, page 10, paragraphs 158 & 168, noted the actions taken by debtor and collect);

running a context service that matches the first and second service entities despite the different first and second metadata attributes thereof (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table);

determining that an action is available to be performed based on a corresponding classification of the availability of the action for each of the matched first and second service entities (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168-170); and

displaying the action available to be performed (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168 & 170).

However, Tracey does not explicitly teach a method of describing a format of data processed by the second service entity.

In the same field of endeavor, Evans teaches a method of describing a format of data processed by the second service entity (Evans: fig. 12, page 12, paragraph 136, noted the collector's metadata field).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of obtaining the collector's metadata field as taught by Evans in Tracey's invention in order to provide an efficient and easy to use interface to navigate the account information (Evans: page 12, paragraph 136).

With respect to **claim 2**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as optimistically available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 3**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 2, wherein classifying the actions as optimistically available comprises classifying the actions as available subject to a rule (Tracey, page 6, paragraph 98 and page 18, paragraphs 264-266, noted the rule).

With respect to **claim 4**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as available according to a rule (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 5**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein classifying the actions as available according to a rule comprises classifying the actions as being available only if the rule is complied with (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 6**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the classifying the actions comprises classifying the actions as universally available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 8**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising consolidating the first and second service entities into a context entity (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 164-168) and matching an application entity to the context entity (Tracey, page 12, paragraphs 182-183).

With respect to **claim 9**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising providing a view at an application of the actions available to be performed on each of the related service entities at the application services (Tracey, fig. 8-10, page 15, paragraphs 219-225 and page 16, paragraphs 242-244).

With respect to **claim 10**, Tracey teaches a method for providing to an application an action available to be performed on a first service entity at a first application service, the method comprising:

running a context service that matches a second service entity to an associated context entity derived from the first service entity, the first service entity being associated with a first application service (Tracey: page 11, paragraph 176, noted the debt collection application) and the second service entity being associated with a second application service different from the first application service (Tracey: page 11, paragraph 170, noted the collector application), the first service entity of the first application service having first metadata attributes associated therewith (Tracey: fig. 3, noted the debtor's metadata attributes) and the second service entity of the second

application service having second metadata attributes associated therewith (Tracey: fig. 2-3, noted the collector's metadata attributes), the first metadata attributes describing a format of data processed by the first service entity (Tracey: fig. 2, and page 9, paragraph 154, noted the debtor's data fields), the first metadata attributes of the first service entity being different from the second metadata attributes of the second service entity (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table), the matching of the first and second service entities being performed despite the different first and second metadata attributes thereof (Tracey: fig. 3, page 10, paragraphs 165-168, noted the debtor and collector have different metadata attributes but they are related in the same bins table),

wherein the first service entity associated with a first distinct application service and the second service entity associated with a second distinct application service can be implemented in Java (Tracey: page 8, paragraph 130 and page 10, paragraph 163),

wherein the first application service is connected via a network to the second application service (Tracey: fig. 1, page 8, paragraphs 137-138);

identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity (Tracey: fig. 2-3, page 10, paragraphs 159-160 & 165-166);

in response to a selection of the first service entity, determining that an action is available to be performed on the matched first service entity at the first application service based on a classification of the action according to its availability (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168-170); and

displaying the action available to be performed (Tracey: pages 10-11, paragraphs 168 & 170).

However, Tracey does not explicitly teach a method of describing a format of data processed by the second service entity and implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language.

In the same field of endeavor, Evans teaches a method of describing a format of data processed by the second service entity (Evans: fig. 12, page 12, paragraph 136, noted the collector's metadata field).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of obtaining the collector's metadata field as taught by Evans in Tracey's invention in order to provide an efficient and easy to use interface to navigate the account information (Evans: page 12, paragraph 136).

However, Tracey does not explicitly teach a method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language.

In the same field of endeavor, Evans teaches a method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language (Tracey: page 9, paragraph 117 and page 14, paragraph 158).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of implementing the first and second service entities in extensible markup language as taught by Evans in Tracey's invention in order to create highly customized reports for the transaction information (Evans, page 14, paragraph 158).

With respect to **claim 11**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity and a second service entity at a second application service, the first service entity being related to the second service entity (Tracey, figures 1-3, page 8, paragraphs 141-142).

With respect to **claim 12**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is optimistically available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

With respect to **claim 13**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 12, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is available subject to a rule (Tracey, page 6, paragraph 98 and page 18, paragraphs 264-266, noted the rule).

With respect to **claim 14**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is available according to a rule (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 15**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 14, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service based on a classification that the action is available only if the rule is complied with (Tracey, figures 22-23, and page 18, paragraphs 264-266).

With respect to **claim 16**, Tracey teaches the method of claim 10, comprising determining if the action is available to be performed on the first service entity at the first

application service on a classification that the action is universally available (Tracey, Figures 12-13, page 17, paragraph 247).

In regard to **claim 18**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 9. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 9 is used to reject claim 18. By this rationale claim 18 is rejected.

In regard to **claim 19**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 1. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 1 is used to reject claim 19. By this rationale claim 19 is rejected.

With respect to **claim 21**, Tracey teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said action service comprises a tracking mechanism to track performance of the first and the second actions (Tracey, abstract, pages 8-9, paragraph 142).

In regard to **claim 22**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 8. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 8 is used to reject claim 22. By this rationale claim 22 is rejected.

In regard to **claim 23**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 9. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 9 is used to reject claim 23. By this rationale claim 23 is rejected.

9. Claims 7, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tracey et al. (PGPUB: US 2003/0083917 A1)** in view of **Evans et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0019560 A1)** and further in view of **Brendle et al. (PGPUB: US 2005/0021355 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 7**, the combined method of Tracey-Evans teaches all the claimed limitations, except that they do not explicitly teach a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict.

In the same field of endeavor, Brendle teaches a method of determining if performance of the action will result in a conflict (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98, noted prevent locking of the actions result in conflict).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of determining result conflict as taught by Brendle in the combined method of Tracey-Evans's invention in order to prevent locking and provide consistent result (Brendle, page 11, paragraph 98).

In regard to **claims 17 and 20**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 7. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 7 is used to reject claims 17 and 20. By this rationale claims 17 and 20 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Peth (Patent No.: US 6,957,192 B1) discloses a method for automated credit matching.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIN LIU whose telephone number is (571)270-1447.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571)-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lin Liu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445